REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-16, 18, 19, 23 and 24 are pending in the present application. Claims 13 and 18 are amended, claim 17 is cancelled and claims 23 and 24 are added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 18 was objected to; claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; claims 13-16, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Glitho in view of Qui et al.; and claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Glitho in view of Qui et al. and Katsuragawa et al.

Claim 18 has been amended in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested the objection to claim 18 be withdrawn.

Further, regarding the rejection of claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the outstanding Office Action indicates it is unclear what is meant by a user part in dependent claim 16. It is respectfully noted a user part is a well known term in the art and corresponds to a layer above the network layer of the SS7 protocol stack. For example, as shown in the Attachment A (corresponding to Figure 3.2 and a description of the user part from the book entitled Signaling System #7, Fourth edition by Travis Russell), the user part corresponds to level 4 of the SS7 protocol stack. Further, dependent claim 17 has been canceled. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 13-16, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Glitho in view of Qui et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

8

Amended claim 13 is directed to a signal traffic routing method for a signaling network including checking a link determination history to determine whether a signal message is to be routed based on a same Signal Link Selection as a previous Signal Link Selection and routing the signal message through the corresponding link from the link determination history when the signal message has been previously routed using the same Signal Link Selection. The method also includes routing the signal message through a next available link excluding the link from the link determination history when the signal message has not been previously routed using the same Signal Link Selection.

Thus, according to the claimed invention, when more than two links are available in a link set of a route from each signal transfer point of a No. 7 signaling network to a certain destination point, a link is selected using the link determination history or the link determination data, so that the traffic data is distributed to all available links in the link set. Thus, it is possible to prevent the traffic data from being concentrated at a certain signal link as the links are selected based on the link determination history or link determination data.

In a non-limiting example, assume a first signal message data includes an SLS of 000 and a signal message having the same SLS has not previously been routed (and thus is not in the link determination history). Then, the next available link would be selected for the first transmission. If a second transmission included a message having the same SLS of 000, then the second transmission would be transmitted on the same link as determined for the first transmission (*i.e.*, the first transmission having an SLS of 000 is updated in the link determination history, such that when the second transmission is performed, the link determination history is checked to see

if data having the same SLS has been previously transmitted). If a third packet is transmitted with SLS of 001 and data having this same SLS has not been previously transmitted and thus would not be in the link determination history, the next available link would be selected for this transmission. This process continues resulting in all of the available links being utilized.

On the contrary, Glitho merely teaches a routing table including a primary link set and an alternative link set and a method for determining the load induced by a routing verification test on a network (see cols. 4 and 5 of Glitho). However, Glitho does not check to see if a message having a same SLS has been transmitted and which is in a history table, and then transmit this data to a next available link if the available data is not in the history table or transmits the data to the same link as the link used in the history table if the information was in the history table. Qui et al. also do not teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, the combination of Glitho and Qui et al. does not result in all of the available channels being utilized as the present invention. Further, Katsuragawa et al. (which was applied in rejecting dependent claim 17) also does not teach the claimed invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claim 13 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably define over Glitho in view of Qui et al.

Further, the specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. It is believed no new matter has been added and the changes are self explanatory.

In addition, new claims 23 and 24 have also been added to set forth the invention in a varying scope, and Applicants submit the new claims are supported by the originally filed application. In particular, new claim 23 is similar to claim 13, but does not include all of the

elements in claim 13 and has been drafted in a varying scope. Claim 24 depends on claim 23. It is respectfully submitted new claims 23 and 24 are allowable for similar reasons as discussed above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David A. Bilodeau**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is

hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and

please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 36,186
David A. Bilodeau, Esq.
Registration No. 42,325

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/DAB:knv:œe
Date: June 15, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\fk4\Documents\2000\2000-680\32169.doc